MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE DEBATE.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Sir, I request that leave may be granted for making a motion for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Sir, I have also to make another request for leave being granted to make a motion for the adjournment of the debate.

PRESIDENT: According to the Rules, not more than one motion can be made at the same sitting of the Council. Now, as there are two motions here I am afraid I must disallow both.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): No mention has been made as to what the subject is.

PRESIDENT: I do not think that is called for.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Is not the first one eligible to preference?

PRESIDENT: The Rule does not provide for preferences. It simply mentions the number of motions that can be made in one sitting.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil* cum *Devicolam*): I am not questioning the ruling of the President. But I think the Rule has application only to the second and not to the first.

PRESIDENT: I do not think so. It is only a question of interpretation.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): The second was handed over only about 5 minutes after the first.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): It is within the discretion of the President to allow one.

PRESIDENT: I must think about that.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): The Rules are quite clear. It is only stated there that more than one such *motion* shall not be made at the same sitting. That does not mean that many persons may not submit *requests for leave to make motions* for adjournment. *Motion for leave* is quite different from *the request for leave* being granted. So it is within the discretion of the President to allow one, especially the one which was presented first.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): What is to happen if both are considered to be in order?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): The first one should be given preference.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Which is the Rule that says so?

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): If the meaning of the rule is that the moment more than one application is presented for leave being granted to make motion for adjournment of the debate, all such applications should be declared out of order, then, when one member presents such an application to the President, simply for the purpose of making it out of order any other member may at once present to the President another application. What is our position in such circumstances?

PRESIDENT: We expect members, on a very important matter such as an adjournment motion, to arrange these things between themselves.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil* cum *Devicolam*): What is to be done if an official member brings in such a motion?

PRESIDENT: That cannot be possible. I think that is hardly intended.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Sir may I say a word about the point of order? The Rules only provide that not more than one such motion shall be made at the same sitting, that is a motion for adjournment of the debate. Now there are two *requests* for leave being granted for making a motion for adjournment of the debate. There has not been even a single *motion* for the adjournment of the debate. There have been only two *requests*. It is within the discretion of the President to allow one of them, particularly the one that was first tendered. Otherwise any other person, who is interested in defeating the object of the member who has placed an application for leave being granted to make an adjournment motion, has only to persuade any other member to put in an application for an adjournment so that all these applications may be ruled out of order. That seems to me to be very unfair and I think that is not the practice in any of the Legislative Assemblies in the world.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): That may be a point to be considered when the rules are proposed to be altered or amended. As the rules stand at present more than one motion cannot be made in the same sitting.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Can a motion be called a motion proper before the House permits the motion being moved?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): When more than one application is presented to the President the question arises as to how one applicant is to be given preference to another.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Has not the President the discretion in the matter of arranging the business of the day?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): In regard to that point Sir, I have one matter to be placed before the House. The practice in all Houses is to give as much previous notice as is possible for such motions.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): The breaking of the Killipalam, for instance, took place only about 15 minutes back. How can we give previous notice of it in case we want the business of the House to be adjourned for considering the attitude of the P. W. D. in such matters?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): There may be cases in which previous notice could not possibly be given But whenever possible it is necessary to give previous notice to the President so that he may scrutinise it and see whether it is admissible. Unfortunately, in this House, applications for leave for adjournment motions are always sprung upon the President without previous notice. That is very unfair to the President. In this case, I do not know what the subject matter is. All the same I surmise that it is not of such a nature as the member could not have found it possible to give previous notice to the President.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Is it on that ground that the President has disallowed the motion in the present instance?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Mr. Narayana Pillai was present in the House when the President gave his ruling. So he himself ought to know the grounds on which the President disallowed the motions.

PRESIDENT: I will make the position a little more clear. Mr. Raman Menon's motion is in regard to the invocation of the Sea Customs Regulation against the importation of certain newspapers from British India. With regard to that I may say the matter is not of recent happening. It took place as long ago as the 9th of January this year, more than four months ago. And, as regards Mr. Piraviperumal Pillai's application for leave to make an adjournment motion, I understand the incident took place only just a little while ago to-day and nobody can possibly have any information about it. I do not think anybody in this House has any information about it now.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): I had been to the spot.

PRESIDENT: Until experts have gone to the spot and investigated the cause of the collapse of the Killiyar Bridge, nobody can express any opinion upon it. Therefore any discussion on that question must necessarily be of little value.

There is a great deal of difficulty to decide between the two applicants. Mr. Raman Menon had an earlier opportunity of making this motion yesterday and besides it is a matter of comparatively long standing and not very recent. For these two reasons I say on the merits, apart from the technical point, I shall have to disallow it.

As regards Mr. Piraviperumal Pillai's motion, if he presses it, I am willing to allow him to make the motion. But personally, I do not see how a matter about which we are still in ignorance can produce a useful debate.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*) : If it is allowed, the discussion of the motion will take place only at 3-30 P. M. Therefore in the meanwhile the House will be in a position to gather information.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*) : As two adjournment motions have been presented both of them have to be ruled out under the Rules.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*) : I press it, Sir.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): As the Rules do not allow any discretion in allowing the motions it is better for the President to disallow both.

PRESIDENT: The Rules are not very clear on that subject and present a great deal of difficulty. Therefore I must exercise my discretion in the best way I think possible in the interests of the House. I put it to Mr. Piraviperumal Pillai whether he wants to pursue his point and if he does so to permit him to do so to the exhaustion of the time intented for resolutions, I personally have the least objection.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*) : We will take the sense of the House.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnatnad*) : I object to the leave being granted.

PRESIDENT: This is the statement—the unsigned one, I presume, of Mr. Piraviperumal Pillai to discuss the apathetic attitude of the P. W. D. in not looking to the proper condition of the bridges which has resulted in the sudden giving way of Killipalam.

Objection having been taken for leave being granted to your motion, I must ask the members who are for the motion to rise up in their place. (*Five members rose in their places*).

As there are not 20 members in support of the motion, the motion cannot be made.

Resolutions on matters of General Public interest.

PRESIDENT : Now we come to resolutions and the first one stands in the name of Mr. M. N. Pillai, and it runs as follows :—

"This Council recommends to the Government that they be pleased to encourage Homeopathy by a liberal system of grants-in-aid to duly qualified practitioners of the system in Travancore and by opening Homeopathic dispensaries and hospitals in places where there is a great demand for them".

MR. M. N. PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : Sir, I beg to move the following resolution :—

"*This Council recommends to the Government that they be pleased to encourage Homeopathy by a liberal system of grants-in-aid to duly qualified practitioners of the system in Travancore and by opening Homeopathic dispensaries and hospitals in places where there is a great demand for them,*"

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly